### Case 12-32118 Filed 10/14/13 Doc 1181

	19		
1	James O. Johnston (Cal. Bar No. 167330)		
2	Joshua D. Morse (Cal. Bar. No. 211050) David Perez (Cal. Bar No. 286969)		
3	JONES DAY 555 South Flower Street		
	Fiftieth Floor		
4	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: (213) 489-3939		
5	Facsimile: (213) 243-2539 Email: jjohnston@jonesday.com		
6	jmorse@jonesday.com		
7	dperez@jonesday.com		
8	Counsel for Franklin High Yield Tax-Free Income Fund and Franklin California High Yield Municipal Fund		
9	William W. Kannel (admitted pro hac vice)  MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO P.C.  One Financial Center		
10			
11	Boston, MA 02111 Telephone: (617) 542-6000		
12	Facsimile: (617) 542-2241 Email: wkannel@mintz.com		
13	Counsel for Wells Fargo Bank, National Asso Indenture Trustee	octation, as	
14	UNITED STATES DANIZBURTON COURT		
15	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	SACRAM	ENTO DIVISION	
16			
16 17	In re:	Case No. 12-32118-C-9	
	In re: CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,	Case No. 12-32118-C-9 Chapter 9	
17	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,		
17 18			
17 18 19	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.	Chapter 9	
17 18 19 20	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13	
17 18 19 20 21 22	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH YIELD TAX-FREE INCOME FUND,	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13  COMPLAINT FOR	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH YIELD TAX-FREE INCOME FUND, AND FRANKLIN CALIFORNIA HIGH	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13  COMPLAINT FOR	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH YIELD TAX-FREE INCOME FUND, AND FRANKLIN CALIFORNIA HIGH YIELD MUNICIPAL FUND	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13  COMPLAINT FOR	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH YIELD TAX-FREE INCOME FUND, AND FRANKLIN CALIFORNIA HIGH YIELD MUNICIPAL FUND Plaintiffs.	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13  COMPLAINT FOR	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	CITY OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA,  Debtor.  WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, FRANKLIN HIGH YIELD TAX-FREE INCOME FUND, AND FRANKLIN CALIFORNIA HIGH YIELD MUNICIPAL FUND  Plaintiffs.  v.	Chapter 9  Adv. Proceeding No. 13  COMPLAINT FOR	

# 

# 

## 

## 

# 

# 

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION AND THE NEED FOR RELIEF

- 1. Plaintiffs Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, in its capacity as indenture trustee ("Wells Fargo"), and Franklin High Yield Tax-Free Income Fund and Franklin California High Yield Municipal Fund (collectively, "Franklin" and, with Wells Fargo, the "Plaintiffs") bring this action to resolve an actual controversy regarding the \$35,080,000.00 Stockton Public Financing Authority Lease Revenue Bonds, 2009 Series A (Capital Improvement Projects) (the "Bonds"). Wells Fargo is the indenture trustee for the Bonds and Franklin in the sole beneficial owner of the Bonds.
- 2. In its recently-filed Plan of Adjustment and proposed Disclosure Statement, the City of Stockton (the "City"), defendant in this action, has taken the position that the agreements by which the City promised to repay the Bonds constitute leases of nonresidential real property within the meaning of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Through the Plan, the City seeks to reject those agreements pursuant to section 365(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and to apply section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code to limit the claim for amounts due in respect of the Bonds which mature in 2038 to a maximum of three years of debt service. As a consequence, notwithstanding the fact that the City received more than \$30 million in proceeds of the Bonds just four years ago (which the City used to pay for various improvements to City property), the City now seeks to limit its liability in respect of the Bonds to an unsecured claim of less than \$10 million (which the City proposes in the Plan to permanently discharge through a one-time payment of approximately \$95,000, less than 1% of that amount).
- 3. The Plaintiffs dispute that the City's agreements to repay the Bonds constitute leases of nonresidential real property within the meaning of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Although nominally in the form of a lease from and leaseback to the City, those agreements lack the economic substance of "true" leases. Among other things
  - the City's "rent" is the principal and interest due on the Bonds and is unrelated to the rental value of, and does not compensate for, the City's use and occupancy of the "leased" property;

- the City has the right to substitute or remove portions of the "leased" property without any change in "rent" and without the consent of the Plaintiffs in certain circumstances;
- the "leases" terminate if the City prepays the "rent" before the end of the term;
- the nominal lessor paid only \$1 to acquire the "leased" property from the City, and retains no interest in the property upon termination of the "leases"; rather all rights to the property revert to the City; and
- the City is responsible for all obligations associated with the "leased" property, including taxes, assessments, insurance, utilities, and maintenance.
- 4. The economic substance of the agreements that underlie the Bonds is that of a secured financing. In fact, the City forthrightly concedes that those agreements are "financing leases," that the Bonds are "a secured obligation," and that "the leased properties [are] pledged as collateral for the bonds." Notably, the City has paid no "rent" since commencing this case.
- 5. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs seek a declaration that the applicable agreements do not constitute leases of nonresidential real property within the meaning of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and therefore cannot be rejected by the City. The Plaintiffs further seek a declaration that claims in respect of those agreements constitute allowed secured claims within the meaning of section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. Finally, and in the alternative, in the event that the Court concludes that the applicable agreements do constitute leases within the meaning of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Plaintiffs seek a declaration that all "rent" payable under those agreements from the bankruptcy petition date through the effective date of rejection constitutes an administrative expense payable in accordance with sections 365(d)(3) and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims for relief in this adversary proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(b) and 1334(b).

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
2	7
_	0

Fire Station Facilities Improvements. The City will use proceeds of the 2009 Bonds in the approximate amount of \$5.335 million to finance the costs of constructing and installing fire station facilities improvements, including modernizing and expanding Fire Station No 7, located in northern Stockton, from 3,800 square feet to 5,600 square feet; constructing and equipping an approximately 7,250 square foot Fire Station No. 13 in northeast Stockton; and developing a master plan study for fire station facilities within the City. Construction of this component of the Project commenced in January 2008 and is expected to be completed in December 2009.

**Police Communication Center Expansion and Relocation**. The City will use proceeds of the 2009 Bonds in the approximate amount of \$3.8 million to finance the costs of relocating and constructing an approximately 24,000 square foot Police Communications Center. This new facility will be located at 22 East Weber Street in the central area of the City. Construction of this component of the Project commenced in September 2008 and is expected to be completed in December 2009.

**Park and Facility Improvements.** The City will use proceeds of the 2009 Bonds in the approximate amount of \$11.120 million to finance the costs of acquiring land and constructing seven parks located throughout the City. This component of the Project commenced in January 2008 and is expected to be completed in September 2009.

**Street Improvements.** The City will use proceeds of the 2009 Bonds in the approximate amount of \$10.457 million to finance the costs of acquiring, constructing and installing various paving, bridge, widening, lighting, landscaping and other street improvements within the City. Construction of this component of the Project commenced in January 2008 and is expected to be completed in December 2009.

Official Statement at 15-16.

- 15. **The Nominal Lease**. To consummate the financing, the City first executed the "Site and Facility Lease," dated as of September 1, 2009 (the "Nominal Lease"), a copy of which is attached as *Exhibit C*, with the Authority. The Nominal Lease was recorded with the office of the Recorder of the County of San Joaquin, State of California, on September 8, 2009.
- 16. The Authority is a joint powers authority, organized pursuant to a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, dated as of June 18, 1990, between the City and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Stockton. The Authority is controlled by the City. Among other things, the Authority is governed by a five-member Board comprised of the members of the City Council of the City; the Administrator of the Authority is the City Manager of the City; the Secretary of the Authority is the City Clerk of the City; and the Treasurer/Controller of the Authority is the Chief Financial Officer of the City. The Authority "was formed for the public purpose of aiding the

financing of projects for the City and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Stockton."
Official Statement at 73.
17. In the Nominal Lease, the City granted the Authority an interest in the real
property described on Exhibit A to the Nominal Lease (the "Site") and the facilities on the Site as
described in Exhibit B to the Nominal Lease (the "Facility" and, together with the Site, the
"Property"), which are commonly known as Oak Park, Swenson Golf Course, and Van Buskirk
Golf Course. Nominal Lease § 2. Exhibit B to the Nominal Lease describes the Facility as
follows:
Oak Park. This property is an approximately 61.2 acre park, located bounded on the east by Union Pacific railroad tracks, on the north
by East Fulton Street, on the south by East Alpine Street, and on the west by North Sutter and Alvarado Streets. This park features group picnic
areas, 20 picnic tables, two tot lots, 15 barbecue pits, and four restrooms.  In addition, Oak Park features 11 tennis courts, two regulation softball
fields, the Billy Hebert Field, a 6,000 seat, regulation professional minor
league baseball field, renovated in 2002; and a multi-use field, a community swimming pool complex with changing facilities, and an approximately 12,875 agrees fact in a right facility with goating for 250.
approximately 13,875-square-foot ice-rink facility with seating for 350. An approximately 5,000 square feet, one-story senior center, which is
available for rental to the public, is also located at Oak Park.
Swenson Golf Course. This property was opened in 1952 and is located on approximately 219 acres at 6803 Alexandria Place. Swenson Golf Course features a classic championship 18-hole, 72 par course, a
nine-hole executive, par 3 course, a 15 station driving range, two putting greens and a practice bunker, [and] paved cart paths. There is also a
clubhouse, an approximately 2,000 square foot pro shop, an approximately 5,000 square foot maintenance and storage facility and an
approximately 2,500 square foot café with seating located on this property.
Van Buskirk Golf Course. This property was opened in 1962 and is located on approximately 214.0 acres at 1740 Houston Avenue. Van Buskirk Golf Course features a classically designed par 72, 18-hole
course, an all grass driving range with 15 stations, two practice greens, and partially paved cart paths. There is also, a clubhouse, an
approximately 2,000 square foot pro shop, an approximately 5,000 square foot maintenance and storage facility and an approximately 2,500 square
foot cafe with seating located on this property.
Nominal Lease, Ex. B.
18. The "rent" payable by the Authority under the Nominal Lease is a nominal \$1.00.
Nominal Lease § 4 ("The City acknowledges receipt from the Authority as and for rental
hereunder the sum of one dollar (\$1.00), on or before the date of delivery of this Site and Facility

Lease."). The "rent" under the Nominal Lease was not calculated to compensate the City for use and occupancy of the Property.

19. The term of the Nominal Lease nominally runs through September 1, 2038, but is contingent on the earlier or later maturity and payment in full of the Bonds:

The term . . . shall end on September 1, 2038, unless such term is extended or sooner terminated as hereinafter provided. If, on September 1, 2038, the aggregate amount of Lease Payments (as defined in and as payable under the Lease Agreement) shall not have been paid, or provision shall not have been made for their payment, then the term of this Site and Facility Lease shall be extended until such Lease Payments shall be fully paid or provision made for such payment. If, prior to September 1, 2038, all Lease Payments shall be fully paid or provision made for such payment in accordance with Section 4.3 or 4.4 of the Lease Agreement, the term of this Site and Facility Lease shall end ten (10) days thereafter.

#### Nominal Lease § 3.

- 20. Notwithstanding the Nominal Lease of the Property, the City remains liable for "any and all assessments of any kind or character and also all taxes, including possessory interest taxes, levied or assessed upon the" Property. Nominal Lease § 13. The Nominal Lease does not require the Authority to maintain or repair the Property or to procure insurance for the Property.
- 21. In the event that all or part of the Property is taken by eminent domain, "the interest of the Authority shall be recognized and is hereby determined to be the amount of the then unpaid Bonds including the unpaid principal and interest with respect to any such Bonds then outstanding . . . ." Nominal Lease § 14.
- The Leaseback Agreement. Concurrently with execution of the Nominal Lease, the City and the Authority executed the "Lease Agreement," dated as of September 1, 2009 (the "Leaseback Agreement" and, together with the Nominal Lease, the "Agreements"), a copy of which is attached as *Exhibit D*. A Memorandum of Lease Agreement reflecting the Leaseback Agreement was recorded in the office of the Recorder of the County of San Joaquin, State of California, on September 8, 2009.
- 23. The recitals to the Leaseback Agreement state that the City and Authority executed the Nominal Lease "for the purpose of enabling the City to finance various capital improvements throughout the geographic boundaries of the City" and recite that, "in order to provide the

revenues necessary to enable the Authority to pay debt service on the Bonds as it becomes due, the Authority proposes to lease the Property back to the City." Leaseback Agreement at 1.

- 24. Thus, pursuant to the Leaseback Agreement, the Authority purported to sublease back to the City the very same Property that is the subject of the Nominal Lease. Leaseback Agreement § 4.1. Notably, however, the Leaseback Agreement also enables the City to substitute all or any portion of the "leased" Property with other property, without the consent of the Authority, upon the satisfaction of specified conditions. Leaseback Agreement §§ 8.3(a), 8.3(b). The Leaseback Agreement also empowers the City to remove and release from the purported leasehold portions of the Property, with title to such removed and released Property vesting unencumbered by the Outstanding Bonds with the City, without the consent of the Authority upon the satisfaction of specified conditions. Leaseback Agreement §§ 8.3(c), 8.3(d).
- 25. In turn, the City agreed to pay "rent" exactly equal to the amounts due and payable on the Bonds and under the Indenture: "In consideration of the lease of the Property from the Authority hereunder and subject to the provisions of Section 6.2, the City agrees to pay to the Authority, its successors and assigns, as rental for the use and occupancy of the Property during each Fiscal Year, the Lease Payments (denominated into components of principal and interest) for the Property . . . ." Leaseback Agreement § 4.3(a). Further, "[i]n the event the City should fail to make any of the payments . . . , the payment in default shall continue as an obligation of the City until the amount in default shall have been fully paid, and the City agrees to pay the same with interest thereon, from the date of default to the date of payment at the highest rate of interest borne by any Outstanding Bond." Leaseback Agreement § 4.3(b). The City's obligation to pay "rent" under the Leaseback Agreement is subject to abatement only in the event that the Property destroyed, damaged to the extent that the City's ability to use the Property is substantially impeded, or taken permanently by eminent domain. Leaseback Agreement § 6.2.
- 26. The "rent" under the Leaseback Agreement was not calculated to compensate the Authority for use and occupancy of the Property (or any property substituted for the Property).
- 27. As with the Nominal Lease, the term of the Leaseback Agreement nominally runs through September 1, 2038, but is contingent on the earlier or later maturity and payment in full

of the Bonds: "This Lease Agreement . . . shall end on the earlier of September 1, 2038, or such earlier date on which the Bonds shall no longer be Outstanding under the Indenture. If, on September 1, 2038, the Indenture shall not be discharged by its terms or if the Lease Payments payable hereunder shall have been abated at any time and for any reason, then the Term of the Lease Agreement shall be extended until there has been deposited with the Trustee an amount sufficient to pay all obligations due under the Lease Agreement, but in no event shall the Term of the Lease Agreement extend beyond September 1, 2048." Leaseback Agreement § 4.2.

- 28. The Leaseback Agreement further provides the City with the right "to prepay the principal component of the Lease Payments in full, or in part, without premium," Leaseback Agreement § 4.4, and provides that "all right, title and interest of the Authority in and to the Property shall be transferred to and vested in the City" upon payment in full of the Bonds, Leaseback Agreement § 4.6. Thus, the Authority retains no interest in the Property upon termination of the Leaseback Agreement.
- 29. Under the Leaseback Agreement, "all improvement, repair and maintenance of the Property shall be the responsibility of the City" and the City is liable for "all taxes and assessments of any type or nature, if any, charged to the Authority or the City affecting the Property or the respective interests or estates therein." Leaseback Agreement § 5.1. The City also is obligated to maintain public liability, property damage, fire and extended coverage, and rental interruption insurance. Leaseback Agreement § 5.3-5.5.
- 30. Finally, the Leaseback Agreement expressly contemplates issuance of the Bonds and delivery of the proceeds to the City: "The Authority agrees that the proceeds of sale of the Bonds shall be paid to the Trustee on the Closing Date for deposit and application pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Indenture, which terms and conditions authorize the City to draw upon specified proceeds of the Bonds for purposes of financing the Project." Leaseback Agreement § 3.1.
- 31. In the event of a default under the Leaseback Agreement, the Authority has the right to possess the Property and re-lease it for the term of the Bonds. Leaseback Agreement § 9.2.

- 32. <u>The Bonds</u>. Concurrently with execution of the Nominal Lease and Leaseback Agreement, the Authority executed the Indenture with Wells Fargo and issued the Bonds.
- 33. The Bonds are limited obligations of the Authority and, in the absence of an exercise of remedies under the Indenture, are payable only from the payments made by the City under the Leaseback Agreement and the other amounts held by Wells Fargo pursuant to the Indenture. Indenture § 11.01.
- 34. In the Indenture, the Authority assigned to Wells Fargo all of its rights in the Leaseback Agreement and the Nominal Lease. Indenture § 5.01(b). Pursuant to that assignment, among other things, Wells Fargo is "entitled to and shall . . . take all steps, actions and proceedings which [Wells Fargo] determines to be reasonably necessary in its judgment to enforce, either jointly with the Authority or separately, all of the rights of the Authority [and] all of the obligations of the City under the Lease Agreement." *Id.* The Indenture further authorizes owners of the Bonds to exercise rights and remedies under the Indenture in specified circumstances and by direction through Wells Fargo. Indenture §§ 7.05, 7.06.
- 35. In the Leaseback Agreement, the City expressly acknowledged and consented to the Authority's assignment of rights to Wells Fargo and the owners of the Bonds. Leaseback Agreement at 1 and §§ 3.1, 8.1, 9.7 ("Such rights and remedies as are given to the Authority under this Article IX have been assigned by the Authority to the Trustee under the Indenture, to which assignment the City hereby consents. Such rights and remedies shall be exercised by the Trustee and the Owners of the Bonds as provided in the Indenture."), 10.10.
- 36. As of August 16, 2013, the City's unpaid obligations under the Leaseback Agreement in respect of the Bonds totaled \$39,663,585.93, plus unliquidated amounts, consisting of (a) principal on the Bonds in the amount of \$35,080,000.00; (b) accrued but unpaid interest on the Bonds in the aggregate amount of at least \$4,176,614.70; (c) accrued but unpaid default interest on the Bonds in the aggregate amount of at least \$186,498.60; and (d) accrued fees, expenses and other Additional Payments of \$220,472.63.

#### B. The City's Bankruptcy Case And Plan Of Adjustment.

- 37. On or about March 1, 2012, the City failed to make the scheduled "rent" payment due under the Leaseback Agreement in the amount of \$1,207,918.75. As a consequence, the Authority was unable to make the scheduled payment on the Bonds in that amount and an Event of Default occurred under Section 7.01 of the Indenture.
- 38. The City filed a petition under chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code on June 28, 2012 (the "Petition Date").
- 39. The City has made no payments under the Leaseback Agreement since the Petition Date. As a consequence, the Authority has made no payments on the Bonds since the Petition Date and Events of Default under the Indenture have occurred and are continuing. At times, the City has been and continues to be in possession and control of the Property.
- 40. On August 15, 2013, Wells Fargo filed a proof of secured claim in respect of the City's obligations under the Nominal Lease and the Leaseback Agreement, which has been identified as Claim Number 187-1 on the official claims register in the City's bankruptcy case (the "Claim"). A copy of the Claim, without Schedule 1 to the Addendum to Proof of Claim, is attached as *Exhibit E*.
- 41. On September 27, 2013, the City posted on its website a draft plan of adjustment and disclosure statement, together with a staff report recommending that the City Council authorize the City Manager to file and prosecute a plan and disclosure statement in substantially the form of the posted drafts (the "Staff Report"). A copy of the Staff Report is attached as *Exhibit F*. The Staff Report states that the Bonds are "a secured obligation (Oak Park and two golf courses)" and that the "the leased properties [are] pledged as collateral for the bonds." Staff Report at 18, 22.
- 42. In a presentation to the City Council on October 3, 2013, City staff described the Property as "Leased property/collateral" and stated that "Franklin could take collateral (leasehold interest in facilities)" under the City's proposed plan.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

43. Subsequently on October 3, 2013, the City Council authorized the City Manager to proceed and the City thereafter filed its proposed Plan of Adjustment [docket no. 1133] (the "Plan") and Disclosure Statement [docket no. 1134] (the "Disclosure Statement").

- 44. The Disclosure Statement characterizes the Nominal Lease and the Leaseback Agreement as "financing leases," Disclosure Statement at 35, and acknowledges that those agreements were executed "[i]n order to facilitate the financing to be provided by the" Bonds, *id.* at 54.
- Agreement to be rejected pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Plan at 77. The Plan also contemplates that any claim for rejection of the Leaseback Agreement would be subject to the damage limitation provisions of section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code. *Id.* at 22. The Plan classifies all claims relating to the Nominal Lease and Leaseback Agreement as "General Unsecured Claims" and proposes to permanently discharge them through a payment of 0.93578% of the allowed amount of the claims. *Id.* at 51, 70. Accordingly, the City proposes to pay approximately \$95,000 in satisfaction and discharge of all of its payment obligations in respect of the \$35 million in Bonds. Disclosure Statement at 33.

#### **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

#### **COUNT ONE**

# Declaratory Relief (Agreements Not Leases Within The Meaning Of The Bankruptcy Code)

- 46. The Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate as if fully set forth herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 to 45 of this Complaint.
- 47. This cause of action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

The Plaintiffs object to that treatment and reserve all rights in respect of the Plan and Disclosure Statement.

- 48. An actual controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and the City regarding the nature of the Agreements.
- 49. As demonstrated by the Plan, the City asserts that the Agreements are leases of nonresidential real property within the meaning of and capable of rejection pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and subject to the damage claim limitations of section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code.<sup>2</sup>
- 50. The Plaintiffs allege that the Agreements, in economic substance, constitute a secured financing transaction by which the City borrowed more than \$30 million in proceeds of the Bonds to finance the Projects. The Plaintiffs allege that, as a consequence, the Agreements, which pertain to the Property and have no relationship to the Project, are not leases of nonresidential real property within the meaning of and capable of rejection pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and are not otherwise subject to the damage claim limitations of section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 51. Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code applies, in relevant part, only to "true" leases in which the lessee pays a rent calculated to compensate the lessor for the ongoing use and consumption of the leased property. Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code does not apply to "financing" leases that represent a borrower's cost of funds for capital assets and improvements.
- 52. Similarly, the damage limitation provisions of section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code only apply to "true" leases that are susceptible to rejection pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Accordingly, the damage limitation provisions of section 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code do not apply to "financing" leases that may not be rejected pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 53. Further, in a chapter 9 case, "[a] lease to a municipality shall not be treated as an executory contract or unexpired lease for the purposes of section 365 or 502(b)(6) of [the Bankruptcy Code] solely by reason of its being subject to termination in the event the debtor fails to appropriate rent." 11 U.S.C. § 929.

All applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code cited in this Complaint are made applicable to cases under chapter 9 by section 901 of the Bankruptcy Code.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6

28

54. Accordingly, pursuant to sections 365, 502(b)(6) and 929 of the Bankruptcy Code and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, the Plaintiffs are entitled to and respectfully request that the Court declare and adjudge that: (a) the Nominal Lease is not an unexpired lease of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of sections 365 and 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code; and (b) the Leaseback Agreement is not an unexpired lease of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of sections 365 and 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code.<sup>3</sup>

#### **COUNT TWO**

#### Declaratory Relief (Agreements Give Rise To Claims Secured By An Interest In The Property)

- 55. The Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate as if fully set forth herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 to 54 of this Complaint.
- 56. This cause of action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.
- 57. An actual controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and the City regarding the nature of the claims arising under the Agreements.
- 58. As demonstrated by the Plan, the City asserts that the claims arising under the Agreements are general unsecured claims.
- 59. The Plaintiffs allege that the Agreements, in economic substance, constitute a secured financing transaction by which the City borrowed more than \$30 million in proceeds of the Bonds. The Plaintiffs further allege that the claims arising under the Agreements are secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable interest in and to the Property.
- 60. Section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides in part that "[a]n allowed claim of a creditor secured by a lien on property in which the estate has an interest . . . is a secured claim to the extent of the value of such creditor's interest in the estate's interest in such property . . . ." 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Contrary to the assertions of the City in the Disclosure Statement, the Agreements need not be deemed "leases" in order to fall within the exception to the indebtedness limitation of Article XVI, Section 18 of the California Constitution, as described in *City of Los Angeles v. Offner*, 19 Cal. 2d 483 (1942), and *Dean v. Kuchel*, 35 Cal. 2d 444 (1950).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

61. Pursuant to section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, the Plaintiffs are entitled to and respectfully request that the Court declare and adjudge that the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim, are allowed claims secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable security interest in and lien upon the Property and such other collateral as set forth in the Indenture.

#### **COUNT THREE**

#### Declaratory Relief (Agreements Give Rise To Claims Secured By An Equitable Interest In The Property)

- 62. The Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate as if fully set forth herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 to 61 of this Complaint.
- 63. This cause of action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.
- 64. An actual controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and the City regarding the nature of the claims arising under the Agreements.
- 65. As demonstrated by the Plan, the City asserts that the claims arising under the Agreements are general unsecured claims.
- 66. The Plaintiffs allege that the Agreements, in economic substance, constitute a secured financing transaction by which the City borrowed more than \$30 million in proceeds of the Bonds. The Plaintiffs further allege that the claims arising under the Agreements are secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable interest in and to the Property.
- 67. Section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides in part that "[a]n allowed claim of a creditor secured by a lien on property in which the estate has an interest . . . is a secured claim to the extent of the value of such creditor's interest in the estate's interest in such property . . . ." 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).
- 68. Pursuant to section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, the Plaintiffs are entitled to and respectfully request that the Court declare and adjudge that the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim, are allowed claims

1	secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable equitable mortgage and/or equitable lien upon the		
2	Property and such other collateral as set forth in the Indenture.		
3	COUNT FOUR		
4	Declaratory Relief		
5	(Value And Extent Of Secured Claim)		
6	69. The Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate as if fully set forth herein the allegations set		
7	forth in Paragraphs 1 to 68 of this Complaint.		
8	70. This cause of action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C.		
9	§ 2201.		
10	71. An actual controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and the City regarding the		
11	value of the property that secures the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims		
12	set forth in the Claim.		
13	72. Section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides in part that the value of a		
14	creditor's interest in the estate's interest in property "shall be determined in light of the purpose		
15	of the valuation and of the proposed disposition or use of such property, and in conjunction with		
16	any hearing on such disposition or use or on a plan affecting such creditor's interest." 11 U.S.C.		
17	§ 506(a).		
18	73. Pursuant to section 506(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and in		
19	light of the Plan and the current status of the City's bankruptcy case, the Plaintiffs are entitled to		
20	and respectfully request that the Court declare and adjudge the value of the property that secures		
21	the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim.		
22	COUNT FIVE		
23	Declaratory Relief		
24	(Alternative Claim For Administrative Rent)		
25	74. The Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate as if fully set forth herein the allegations set		
26	forth in Paragraphs 1 to 73 of this Complaint.		
27	75. This cause of action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C.		
28	§ 2201.		

- 76. An actual controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and the City regarding the City's obligations under the Agreements in the event that the Court determines that the Agreements constitute unexpired leases of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of section 365.
- 77. The City has made no payments under the Leaseback Agreement since the Petition Date and has not indicated any willingness to do so at any time hereafter.
- 78. The City has been in possession and control of the Property at all time since the Petition Date and has benefitted from its use and occupancy of the Property.
- 79. The Plaintiffs allege that, solely to the extent that the Court determines that the Agreements constitute unexpired leases of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, all "rent" payable by the City and all of the City's obligations arising under the Agreements from the Petition Date through the effective date of rejection of the Agreements constitute an administrative expense payable in accordance with sections 365(d)(3) and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 80. Section 365(d)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that "[t]he trustee shall timely perform all the obligations of the debtor . . . arising from and after the order for relief under any unexpired lease of nonresidential real property, until such lease is assumed or rejected, notwithstanding section 503(b)(1) of this title." 11 U.S.C. § 365(d)(3).
- 81. Section 503(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that "there shall be allowed administrative expenses . . . including the actual, necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate . . . ." 11 U.S.C. § 503(b).
- 82. Accordingly, as an alternative form of relief and solely to the extent that the Court determines that the Agreements constitute unexpired leases of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, pursuant to sections 365(d)(3) and 503(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, the Plaintiffs are entitled to and respectfully request that the Court declare and adjudge that all "rent" payable by the City and all of the City's obligations arising under the Agreements from the Petition Date through the

effective date of rejection of the Agreements constitute an administrative expense payable in accordance with sections 365(d)(3) and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code.

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter a judgment:

- (1) Declaring that the Nominal Lease is not an unexpired lease of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of sections 365 and 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code;
- (2) Declaring that the Leaseback Agreement is not an unexpired lease of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of sections 365 and 502(b)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code;
- (3) Declaring that the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim, are allowed claims secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable security interest in and lien upon the Property and such other collateral as set forth in the Indenture;
- (4) Declaring that the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim, are allowed claims secured by a valid, perfected and enforceable equitable mortgage and/or equitable lien upon the Property and such other collateral as set forth in the Indenture.
- (5) Declaring the value of the property that secures the claims arising under the Agreements, including the claims set forth in the Claim.
- Agreements constitute unexpired leases of real property within the meaning, scope and operation of section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, declaring that all "rent" payable by the City and all of the City's obligations arising under the Agreements from the Petition Date through the effective date of rejection of the Agreements constitute an administrative expense payable in accordance with sections 365(d)(3) and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code.

### Case 12-32118 Filed 10/14/13 Doc 1181

1	(7) Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.	
2 3	Dated: October 14, 2013	JONES DAY
		/s/ James O. Johnston James O. Johnston
5		Joshua D. Morse
6		David Perez
7		Counsel for Franklin
		- and -
8 9		William W. Kannel (admitted pro hac vice) MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO P.C.
10		Counsel for Wells Fargo
11		V
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		